

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

RICHARD MOONEY,

CASE NO. 2:24-mc-00002-LK

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION
FOR WRIT OF GARNISHMENT

ROLLER BEARING COMPANY OF AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant.

V.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

Garnishee-Defendant

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Richard Mooney's Amended Application for Writ of Garnishment. Dkt. No. 3. The application is denied without prejudice to renew.

“Garnishment is a statutory remedy that requires strict adherence to the procedures expressly authorized by statute.” *Watkins v. Peterson Enters., Inc.*, 973 P.2d 1037, 1043 (Wash. 1999). Here, the proposed writ states that the total amount is owing, “*plus* post-judgment interest and estimated garnishment costs and fees” but the total amount listed in that paragraph already

1 includes the interest, costs, and fees. Dkt. No. 3-2 at 1 (emphasis added); *see also* Dkt. No. 3 at 2
2 (stating in the amended application that “[t]he amount alleged to be due is the balance of the
3 judgment or amount of claim, **\$759,553.13**, plus interest and estimated garnishment costs and fees
4 as indicated in the writ of garnishment.”).

5 The application is therefore DENIED without prejudice. These may not be the only
6 shortcomings in Plaintiff’s amended application, but the Court need not scour the record any
7 further. Plaintiff may file another amended application by February 20, 2024. If the Court does not
8 receive an amended application by that date, it will direct the Clerk to close this matter.

9 These errors have unnecessarily multiplied the proceedings in this case. Future errors may
10 result in the imposition of sanctions. LCR 11(c).

12 Dated this 23rd day of January, 2024.

13 
14 Lauren King
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24